Notice of Determination

Appendix D

To:

☒ Office of Planning and Research

U.S. Mail: P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Street Address: 1400 Tenth St., Rm 113, Sacramento, CA 95814

☐ County Clerk
County of: San Luis Obispo
Address: 1055 Monterey Street, Room D120
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-3237

From:
Public Agency: Templeton Community Services D tr
Address: 420 Crocker Street, PO BOX 780
Templeton, CA 93465
Contact: Dave Andres
Phone: 805 434-4900

Lead Agency (if different from above):
Address:
Contact:
Phone:

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to State Clearinghouse): SCH# 2012041010

Project Title: Templeton Community Services District Wastewater Flow Re-routing Project

Project Proponent: Templeton Community Services District

Project Location (include county): 2.4 mile pipeline in Templeton, San Luis Obispo County

Project Description:

See attachment A

This is to advise that the Templeton Community Service District has approved the project change on
(☒ Lead Agency or ☐ Responsible Agency)

May 21, 2013 and has made the following determinations regarding the project change:
(date)

1. The project change will not have a significant effect on the environment, or increase the severity of previously identified significant effects.
2. A First Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration respecting the proposed project change was prepared and certified pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigated Measures approved for the previously approved project were incorporated into the approval of the project change, as applicable.
4. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was not adopted for the project change.
5. Findings were made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the First Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration and record of approval of the Project Change are available to the general public at the Templeton Community Services District, 420 Crocker Street, Templeton, CA 93465.

Signature (Public Agency): David J Andres Title: Interim General Manager
Date: May 23, 2013 Date Received for filing at OPR:

Authority cited: Sections 21083, Public Resources Code.
Reference Section 21000-21174, Public Resources Code.

Revised 2011

RECEIVED
MAY 29 2013
STATE CLEARING HOUSE

ENDORSED
FILED
MAY 28 2013
JULIE L. RODEWALD COUNTY CLERK
BY CAREY BLANDFORD
DEPUTY CLERK

Templeton Community Services District
P.O. Box 780 / 420 Crocker Street
Templeton CA 93465 805-434-4900 • 805-434-4820 fax

Addendum No.1 to the Templeton Community Services District Wastewater Flow Re-routing Project Mitigated Negative Declaration- SCH #2012041010

Changes to the original Initial Environmental Study are in bold type.

1. Project Title:

Templeton CSD Wastewater Flow Re-Routing Project

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

Templeton Community Services District
P.O. Box 780
Templeton CA 93465

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

David Foote, c/o ***firma***, (805) 781-9800

4. Project Location:

The new pipeline alignment would run along approximately 2.4 miles connecting to existing TCSD facilities and pipelines. The northern end of the new pipeline would connect at TCSD facilities near Volpi Ysabel Road and the railroad tracks east of U.S. 101, and would connect at the southern end near the intersection of Peterson Ranch Road and Duncan Road west of U.S. 101. **Figure 5 on page 6 of the attached 'Addendum to a Previous Archaeological Inventory Survey of a Proposed +-2.3 Mile Sewer Line, Templeton, San Luis Obispo County, California' shows the pipeline route changes that is the subject of this Addendum to the MND.**

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Same as Lead Agency

6. General Plan Designation:

Generally in rights of ways and passing along or across Industrial, Commercial service and Commercial retail, residential suburban and residential single family and agriculture land use designations.

7. Zoning:

Industrial, Commercial service and Commercial retail, residential suburban and residential single family and agriculture

8. Description of the Project:

This Addendum No. 1 begins with an overview of the Proposed Project, a discussion of the purpose of the Addendum, followed by a description of the proposed change that would be made by TCSD to the previously approved TCSD Wastewater Flow Re-routing Project. Potential environmental effects are evaluated and a conclusion based on the analysis is presented.

Changes to the original Initial Environmental Study are in bold type.

The Templeton Community Services District (TCSD) proposes a change in wastewater operations that requires a Wastewater Change Petition subject to approval by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The Project would re-route the treatment and disposal location of 220,000 gallons per day ("gpd") to the Meadowbrook wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and Selby Percolation Pond Facility (Selby Ponds). This wastewater is currently discharged

Templeton Community Services District
P.O. Box 780 / 420 Crocker Street
Templeton CA 93465 805-434-4900 • 805-434-4820 fax

to the Salinas River after treatment from the City of Paso Robles WWTP. The Project would require construction of new conveyance infrastructure (pipelines and pumps) in uplands and existing developed areas. The new pipeline alignment would run along approximately 2.4 miles connecting to existing TCSD facilities and pipelines. The Biological Assessment attached to this document contains 17 photographs of the proposed alignment of the pipeline.

The TCSD currently utilizes two wastewater treatment and disposal options. Approximately 220,000 gpd are sent to the Paso Robles WWTP for treatment and disposal, and the remainder of effluent (150,000 gpd) is treated by the TCSD Meadowbrook WWTP and discharged at the Selby Ponds where the treated wastewater percolates into the Salinas River underflow. The Project includes three components 1) cessation of conveyance by TCSD of any wastewater to the Paso Robles WWTP where the treated wastewater is discharged to the Salinas River; 2) the pipeline construction along a 2.4 mile corridor; and (3) the treatment of the wastewater previously conveyed to the Paso Robles WWTP at the TCSD Meadowbrook WWTP where the treated wastewater is discharged to the Selby Ponds.

The TCSD already has the permitted capacity to treat 600,000 gpd of wastewater at its Meadowbrook WWTP and discharge the treated wastewater at the Selby Ponds, inclusive of the redirected 220,000 gpd, per existing WDR Order No. R3- 2007-0029. The environmental impacts for this activity were addressed in a previous CEQA document. The TCSD adopted a mitigated negative declaration for that project in 1998.

The TCSD has revised the proposed pipeline alignment in two locations as shown in the attached Addendum to the Phase 1 Archaeological Surface Survey (April 2013). One change is a different alignment crossing agricultural fields between Main Street and US 101 and the other change is to use public street rights of way for a segment instead of an alignment along the railroad tracks.

9. Purpose of this Addendum

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines sections 15162 through 15164, this Addendum No. 1 to the MND has been prepared to address the proposed change to the pipeline alignment. Copies of the adopted MND for the Wastewater Flow Re-routing Project and related documents are available for review during normal business hours at the TCSD office, 420 Crocker Street, Templeton, California. The evaluation of the proposed change relies on information contained in the previously approved MND and related environmental documents, which are also discussed below.

TCSD determined that an addendum was the appropriate environmental document under CEQA because the proposed change would not involve significant changes to the Wastewater Flow Re-routing **Project requiring the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR as required by CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15163, respectively. As provided by section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, preparation of an addendum to a previously certified EIR or negative declaration is appropriate if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines section 15162 have occurred. Further, section 15162 states that the lead agency (TCSD) shall not prepare a subsequent EIR or negative declaration unless substantial changes occur which require major revisions to the original EIR or negative declaration or the changes result in new or more severe significant effects than shown in the EIR or negative declaration. The evidence to support this determination is contained within this document, and in the files and records of TCSD concerning the adopted MND for the Project. In addition, the circumstances under which the Project has been undertaken have not changed substantially from those existing when the MND for the Project was adopted.**

10. Description of the Change to the Proposed Project

The proposed pipeline has been changed in two locations as shown on the attached Exhibits. The route has been shifted for a segment along the railroad tracks to follow Marquita Avenue west to La Cruz Way and south the Cow Meadow Place, turning back east up a driveway to resume the railroad alignment. Along this alignment where existing mature oak trees canopy over the right of way, the pipeline will be bored if necessary to avoid tree roots. The second change shifts a segment between Main Street and US 101 south

Templeton Community Services District
P.O. Box 780 / 420 Crocker Street
Templeton CA 93465 805-434-4900 • 805-434-4820 fax

crossing open fields to a new freeway under bore location. The proposed changes are to pipeline alignments and the changes do not alter the characteristics of the remainder of the Project.

11. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The new pipeline alignment would be constructed in mostly existing right of way through developed areas and roads, ruderal / grassland habitats along the railroad tracks, and agricultural/grazing fields.

12. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

State Water Resources Control Board- Wastewater Change Petition
County of San Luis Obispo- Grading Permit

13. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a Potentially Significant Impact as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐	Aesthetics	☐	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☐	Public Services
☐	Agriculture Resources	☐	Hydrology and Water Quality	☐	Recreation
☐	Air Quality	☐	Land Use and Planning	☐	Transportation and Traffic
☐	Biological Resources	☐	Mineral Resources	☐	Utilities and Service Systems
☐	Cultural Resources	☐	Noise	☐	Mandatory Findings of Significance
☐	Geology and Soils	☐	Population and Housing		

☐ There is no evidence before the District that the project will have any potential adverse effects on fish and wildlife resources or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. As such, the project qualifies for a de minimis waiver with regards to the filing of Fish and Game Fees.

☒ The project has potential to impact fish and wildlife resources and shall be subject to the payment of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code.

14. Summary of the Addendum

This document has been prepared as an addendum to the MND for the Wastewater Flow Re-routing Project (SCH #2012041010) in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines section 15164. Section 15164(a) provides that, "The lead agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR or negative declaration if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred." Section 15162 requires a subsequent EIR in only the following circumstances:

1. **Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;**
2. **Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or**

Templeton Community Services District
P.O. Box 780 / 420 Crocker Street
Templeton CA 93465 805-434-4900 • 805-434-4820 fax

3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known or could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR or negative declaration was certified as complete, shows any of the following:

(a) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the EIR or negative declaration;

(b) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the EIR or negative declaration;

(c) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(d) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

CEQA Guidelines subsections 15164(c) and (d) go on to state that: (1) the addendum need not be circulated, but can be included in or attached to the adopted negative declaration and that (2) the lead agency must consider the addendum with the adopted negative declaration.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15164(e), an analysis and explanation are provided herein documenting TCSD's decision that preparation of a subsequent MND or EIR is not required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15162, as summarized above. This document supports the finding that the proposed change does not: (1) result in substantial changes to the Proposed Project that require major revisions of the MND for the Proposed Project; (2) result in substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project has been undertaken which would require major revisions to the MND for the Proposed Project; and (3) create any new significant effects and does not substantially increase the severity of any significant impacts identified in the MND for the Proposed Project. In addition, there has been no substantial change in the circumstances surrounding the Proposed Project. Finally, the proposed change does not include new information indicating that any mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible are now considered feasible.

15. Determination:

On the basis of the evaluation in this addendum of the proposed changes to the Project, I find that:

1. **No substantial changes are proposed in the Project, and the proposed changes do not involve potential new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;**
2. **Substantial changes have not occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project will be undertaken which involve potential new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; and**
3. **Since approval of the MND for the Project, no new information has been presented to TCSD and TCSD has not become aware of any new information that shows the following:**
   - **(a) The Project, as changed, may have one or more significant effects not discussed in the MND;**
   - **(b) Significant effects previously examined may be substantially more severe than shown in the MND;**
   - **(c) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible may in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the Project as changed; and**
   - **(d) New or different mitigation measures or alternatives not considered in the MND may substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment identified in the MND.**

For: Templeton Community Services District

Date: **April 10, 2013**

Signature
David Foote ASLA, Consultant

II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?					**X**
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?					**X**
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?					**X**
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?					**X**

Impact Discussion:

1a-d. The proposed Project involves an underground pipeline which will not change the visual character of the environment.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	**7**				**X**
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?					**X**

c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	**7**				**X**

Impact Discussion:

2a-c **The following analysis and conclusions apply to the revised pipeline alignment.** Agricultural lands occurring along the pipeline alignment are dry farmed hay fields that are seeded, mowed and disced each year. The NRCS Soil Survey identifies the Lockwood shaley loam soil on these properties as Class II if irrigated and Class IV if non-irrigated. Pastures of non-native annual grassland used for cattle grazing also occur along the pipeline alignment. Approximately 0.4 miles of the proposed pipeline alignment traverses agricultural lands. Because any disruption of farming operations that may or may not be present during pipeline construction would be temporary and not long-term, no change in farming would result from the Project. Because the area of disturbance is confined to a narrow trench, the mixing of subsoil with topsoil resulting from excavation, pipe placement and trench re-compaction would not result in a significant loss of productive topsoil. The Project would not result in a long-term change to agriculture or impair productive soils. Therefore, no impact is identified. The cessation of TCSD's conveyance of wastewater to the Paso Robles WWTP which is discharged to the Salinas River after treatment, and the resulting increase in discharge of treated wastewater from the Meadowbrook WWTP to the Selby Ponds would not affect any agricultural lands.

		Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3.	**AIR QUALITY.** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	**8**				**X**
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	**8**				**X**
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	**8**				**X**
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?					**X**
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?					**X**

Impact Discussion:

3a-e. The proposed construction of the pipeline would result in construction phase equipment emissions. The SLO County APCD CEQA handbook identifies significance thresholds for air pollutants, including reactive organic gases (ROG) and Nitrous oxides (NOx), diesel particulate matter (DPM), and dust (PM10). Based on this document, the Project would not be expected to exceed construction stage emission thresholds for these pollutants because the work would be completed in less than 90 days and based on a calculation of cubic yards excavated and replaced in the pipeline trench, the daily emissions for DPM, ROG and NOx are a small fraction of the thresholds (CEQA Air Quality Handbook table 2-2). The Project is located on the edge of an area mapped in the CEQA Air Quality Handbook as potentially having naturally occurring asbestos in the geology. It is not anticipated that underlying rock will be encountered because the soils in the

pipeline corridor are deep alluviums. Therefore, exposure to naturally occurring asbestos is not identified as a potential impact.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	**2,3**			**X**	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	**2,3**		**X**		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	**2,3**			**X**	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	**3**		**X**		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	**3**				**X**
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	**3**				**X**

Impact Discussion:

4a. The conclusions in this section of the IS are based on the Biological Assessment by Sage Institute prepared for the proposed Project which is attached to this document for reference. **The following analysis and mitigation measures apply to the revised**

pipeline alignment crossing open fields. No new impacts or mitigation measures are identified for the new alignment. The BA includes correspondence with applicable resource agencies and analysis by Fugro related to the effects of the proposed discharge at the Selby Ponds upon River conditions. The Project has three distinct components 1) the cessation of treated wastewater discharge into the Salinas River at the current outfall location at the Paso Robles Wastewater Treatment Plant; 2) diversion of this water to the existing and permitted TCSD Meadowbrook WWTP for treatment and then discharge to the Selby Ponds about 4 miles upstream from the Paso Robles outfall; and 3) construction of a pipeline to convey the wastewater. The first action, cessation of discharge at the Paso Robles location, has been determined to have a less than significant effect on habitat for the federally threatened south /central California coast steelhead trout, with concurrence by the resource agencies. The second action, percolation of an additional 220,000 gallons per day of treated wastewater to the Selby Ponds, would have the effect of increasing the River underflow with the likelihood of some surficial wetting, as described in the "Revised Numerical Evaluation of Impacts of Treated Wastewater Effluent Discharge in the Selby Percolation Pond Facility on the Salinas River and its Alluvium, Templeton, California" (Fugro, 2012). As described in the "TCSD Change in Wastewater Operations Project Biological Assessment" (Sage Institute, 2012), the potential for increased dry season wetted sediments in the Salinas River from the additional discharge at the Selby Ponds may provide low suitability aquatic habitat within the dry season for the California red-legged frog. No adverse impacts on the aquatic environment in the river are identified. The third action, construction of the pipeline, would result in ground disturbance and temporary noise. The BA identified the following potentially significant impacts on sensitive plant and animal species in the pipeline construction corridor:

- Potential disturbance to occupied American badger dens
- Potential disturbance to sensitive plants that may be present including the special-status plant species associated with upland soils, or ones that may occur in the grassland habitat within the region (Mesa horkelia, Lemmon's jewel-flower, umbrella larkspur, yellow-flowered eriastrum, Santa Cruz Mountains pussypaws,)

Mitigation Measures:

Measure BIO-1 To mitigate potential adverse effects on American badger, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey at least 30 days before initial site disturbance for pipeline construction to identify whether badgers are using any portion of the site. The survey shall cover the boundaries of proposed disturbance and 100 feet beyond, and shall examine both old and new dens. If potential badger dens are found, they shall be inspected to determine whether they are occupied by badgers. Occupation of the den shall be determined by one or more of the following methods:

a. Use of a fiber optic scope to examine the den to the end;
b. Partially obstruct the den entrance with sticks, grass, and leaves for three consecutive nights and examine for signs that animals are entering or leaving the den; and
c. Dust the den entrance with a fine layer of dust or tracking material for three consecutive nights and examine the following mornings for footprints representing badger use.

Inactive dens within construction areas shall be excavated and backfilled by hand with a shovel to prevent re-use of dens during construction. If badgers are found in dens between August and January, a qualified biologist shall establish a 50-foot diameter exclusion zone around the den entrance. To avoid disturbance and the possibility of direct take of badgers, no construction, grading, or staging of equipment shall be conducted within the buffer area until the biologist has determined that the badgers have vacated the den. If badgers are found in dens between February and July, nursing young may be present. Therefore, a County-approved biologist shall establish a 200-foot diameter buffer area around the den. No construction, grading, or staging or equipment shall be conducted within the buffer.

Measure BIO-2 To mitigate potential impacts on sensitive plant species during construction of the pipeline, conduct a floristic inventory and rare plant survey of annual grassland habitat within the Project alignment focusing on the presence/absence of rare, threatened, or endangered plant species discussed above. To ensure adequacy of the floristic inventory and rare plant survey, it should be conducted in accordance with the guidelines recommended by the California Native Plant Society, CDFG, and the USFWS that includes:

- Conducting the survey at the proper time of year when rare plants are both evident and identifiable. This is typically during the spring/summer flowering period.
- Surveys that are floristic in nature. That is all plant species noted in the field are identified to the level necessary to determine if it is rare, threatened, or endangered.
- Conducting the survey using systematic field techniques in all suitable habitats of the site to ensure a reasonable and thorough coverage.
- Up to three visits to the site may be necessary to ensure that seasonal variations in the flowering period of the target species are adequately covered.

If non formally-listed special-status plant species are detected during the above survey, the following should be implemented:

- All soil and plant material that is cleared and grubbed for construction, and the top six inches of surface material excavated for the pipeline trench, shall be salvaged and stockpiled for use in re-spreading on the surface as part of Best Management Practices for restoration of the disturbed areas and to minimize the potential for post-project weed invasion.

4b. The proposed Project would not result in significant changes to the riparian environment as discussed above. No riparian vegetation is proposed for removal. Effects on wetlands, vernal pools and waters of the US are discussed below.

4c. The pipeline alignment crosses three seasonal/ephemeral drainages with established beds and banks that are considered waters of the U.S. and waters of the State subject to US Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Fish and Game jurisdiction. These three drainages are vegetated with non-native annual grasses and weedy species. No ground disturbance is currently proposed within any jurisdictional drainage as the Project proposes to directional bore underneath them.

4d. The BA identifies the potential for construction to disrupt nesting birds along the proposed pipeline route, a potential significant impact.

Mitigation Measure:
Measure BIO-3 Vegetation removal and initial site disturbance shall be conducted between September 1 and January 31 outside of the nesting season for birds. If vegetation removal is planned for the bird nesting season (February 1 to August 31), then preconstruction nesting bird surveys shall be required to determine if any active nests would be impacted by Project construction. If no active nests are found, then no further mitigation shall be required. If any active nests are found that would be impacted by construction, then the nest sites shall be avoided with the establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone around active nests as determined by a qualified biologist. Nest sites shall be avoided and protected with the non- disturbance buffer zone until the adults and young of the year are no longer reliant on the nest site for survival as determined by a qualified biologist. As such, avoiding disturbance or take of an active nest would reduce potential impacts on nesting birds to a less-than-significant level.

4e-f. The proposed Project would not conflict with an HCP or local policy or program.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	**4**				**X**
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	**4**		**X**		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?					**X**
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?					**X**

Impact Discussion:
5a-d. **This section references the archeological investigation prepared by CRMS for the original and revised pipeline route. The analysis and mitigation measure applies to the new pipeline alignment and no new impact or mitigation is identified.** Although occasional Monterey chert fragments were observed in open areas, no evidence of prehistoric or historic artifacts, features, or other indications of significant cultural resources were found during the survey. No significant cultural resources were identified as a result of this investigation of the Project area and no further archaeological work is recommended. While it is unlikely that subsurface remains are present, the nature of a surface survey does not preclude the possible existence of such remains.

Mitigation Measure:
Measure CUL-1 If prehistoric or historic cultural materials are encountered during any phase of property grading or excavation, the work should be halted until a qualified archaeologist can make an assessment of the resources and proper mitigation measures be formulated in accordance with County guidelines.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					**X**
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.					**X**
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?					**X**
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?					**X**
iv) Landslides?					**X**
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?					**X**
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?					**X**
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?					**X**
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?					**X**

Impact Discussion:

6a-e. The Proposed Project does not involve construction of structures subject to seismic risk. The temporary ground modifications consist of trenching and backfill which would not be upon, or result in, unstable soils or geologic conditions. The capacity of the soils to percolate the proposed discharge has been addressed in previous CEQA determinations related to the Selby ponds in 2005 and is further discussed relative to the Salinas River underflow in section 8 of this IS.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?					**X**
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?					**X**
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?					**X**
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?					**X**
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					**X**
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					**X**
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?					**X**
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?					**X**

Impact Discussion:

7a-h. The proposed Project does not involve the use or transport of hazardous materials, is not located near an airport, school or

a hazardous materials site, and as construction is limited to only pipeline installation, the Project would not expose people or structures to wildland fire risks or conflict with any adopted emergency response plan.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	**5.6**				**X**
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	**5,6**			**X**	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?					**X**
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?					**X**
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?					**X**
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?					**X**
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?					**X**
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?					**X**

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?					X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?					X

Impact Discussion:

8a-b. Under the proposed Project, the wastewater flow redirected from the Paso Robles WWTP to the District's Meadowbrook WWTP (approximately 220,000 gpd) will be treated at the latter WWTP and discharged at the Selby Ponds consistent with the District's waste discharge requirements. As a consequence, the Project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise adversely affect water quality. The District's wastewater which is currently transported to the Paso Robles WWTP is discharged after treatment to the Salinas River and either contributes to the River's flow or underflow depending on the season. Only a negligible portion of such discharged treated wastewater may contribute to groundwater recharge. Thus, the Project will not substantially interfere with groundwater supplies or recharge. The production rates at any nearby wells would not be affected. There is no aspect of the Project that would alter existing drainage patterns, or create or contribute to runoff.

8c-j. The Project would not expose people, structures or homes to risks or hazards from flooding.

9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?					X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	1			X	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	1				X

Impact Discussion:

9a. The Project would not result in any physical barrier.

9b. The proposed Project is consistent with the adopted County General Plan which calls for Templeton CSD to seek additional long term water sources. The Project meets the applicable regulations of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the California Department of Health Services and the State Water Resources Control Board.

9c. There is no applicable HCP or conservation plan in effect on this site or in the vicinity.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?					**X**
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	**1**				**X**

Impact Discussion:

10a. The site is not identified as having any mineral resource value.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. NOISE. Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				**X**	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				**X**	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?					**X**
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				**X**	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					**NA**
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					**NA**

Impact Discussion:

11a-f. The Project would not result in a new permanent noise source. Temporary noise increases associated with the operation of trenching equipment will occur near receptors usually considered sensitive: single family homes. However, the activity would be subject to the County noise ordinance for construction /stationary noise sources which limit the times of operation to daytime. Compliance with this ordinance would result in less than significant noise impacts.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	**5,6**			**X**	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					**X**
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of re-placement housing elsewhere?					**X**

Impact Discussion:

12a. The Project would provide additional water resources to the TCSD that would be available to the community to accommodate new development consistent with the County General Plan and as may be approved by the land use authority, San Luis Obispo County. The District has no authority to approve new land uses. The amount of new water that would be available to the District as a result of the Project would not exceed that amount needed to provide for build-out of the community as envisioned in the Salinas Area Plan Update which was environmentally reviewed in the Salinas Area Plan Update Final EIR and which review is incorporated herein.

12b-c. The Project would not displace any housing or people.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. PUBLIC SERVICES.					
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire protection?					**X**
Police protection?					**X**
Schools?					**X**
Parks?					**X**

Other public facilities?					X

Impact Discussion:

13a. The proposed Project will not require public services.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. RECREATION:					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?					X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?					X

Impact Discussion:

14a-b. The Project will not directly increase population or the use of public parks. See also impact discussion under 12a.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:					
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?					X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?					X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?					X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?					X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?					X

f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Impact Discussion:

15a-g. The Project will not increase vehicular trips on the street system, increase hazards on the roadways or result in inadequate emergency access. The Proposed Project will result in a temporary increase in traffic on local streets due to construction vehicles over a period of months. The street network accessing the proposed pipeline route consists of local and collector streets that have adequate capacity and width to accommodate the type of excavating and other equipment that will be used for construction. See also impact discussion under 12a.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16.	**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Impact Discussion:

16a-g. The wastewater flow proposed to be redirected to the Meadowbrook WWTP will be about 220,000 gpd, which together with what is currently treated and discharged at the Meadowbrook WWTP (150,000 gpd), is well below the plant's authorized capacity of 600,000 gpd. The District's existing river wells will not need to be modified in order to retrieve the treated wastewater downstream of the Selby Pond site. The Project's elements do not require the construction of any new stormwater drainage facilities. The Project also does not require a water supply, but instead will generate a limited new supply. The Project will not involve a landfill or solid waste, nor will it increase demand for water and sewer service. The project will not require storm water conveyance improvements off site that might have significant effects on the environment. See also impact discussions under 8a and 12a.

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	**1**			**X**	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	**1**			**X**	

Impact Discussion:

17a. The APCD has not yet established significance thresholds for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from project operations. Nonetheless, lead agencies should make a good-faith effort to identify potential effects of a project individually and cumulatively. In this case other than the temporary trips for the construction crews to reach the site, no heavy motorized equipment will be employed that would create substantial greenhouse gases. The Project has extremely limited potential to contribute a meaningful amount of greenhouse gas.

Mitigation Measures: None

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.					
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	**3,4**			**X**	

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	**3,4**			**X**	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?					**X**

Impact Discussion:

17a. The Project could have adverse effects on limited biological resources, but they are mitigable. The potential limited effects would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The Project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

17b. The proposed Project has effects that are individually limited; and they will be mitigated. These effects, after mitigation, when considered with the effects of past projects or foreseeable future projects are not cumulatively significant.

17.c No substantial adverse effects on people are identified associated with the proposed Project.

17. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one of more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (D0. In this case a discussion should identify the following items:

a) Earlier analysis used.

Salinas Area Plan Update Final EIR, adopted by resolution 96-24 by the County of San Luis Obispo, Mitigated Negative Declaration for Templeton Community Services District Wastewater Treatment Plan Expansion Project adopted by the TCSD in 1998, and the Negative Declaration for the Water Retrieval Project adopted by the TCSD in 2005,

b) Impacts adequately addressed. (Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.)

The Salinas Area Plan Update Final EIR adequately discussed the land use, population and growth impacts of development in the TCSD boundary. The FEIR identified a mitigation measure to expand the TCSD wastewater treatment plant, which has been implemented by the TCSD. The Mitigated Negative Declaration for Templeton Community Services District Wastewater Treatment Plan Expansion Project adequately addressed the effects of the expansion of the wastewater facility and creation of percolation ponds along with the discharge of effluent to these ponds. Mitigation measures were adopted related to construction stage impacts (dust, tree protection, removal of contaminated soils). The Negative Declaration for the Water Retrieval Project adequately addressed the effects of recapture (retrieval) of treated wastewater percolated from the Meadowbrook wastewater treatment facility by pumping that water from the Salinas River underflow at the District's existing downstream well(s).

c) Mitigation measures. (For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific

conditions of the project.) None identified.

18.	SOURCE REFERENCES.
1.	Salinas River Area Plan Land Use Element- Circulation Element, 1996, County of San Luis Obispo
2.	Revised Numerical Evaluation of Impacts of Treated Wastewater Effluent Discharge in the Selby Percolation Pond Facility on the Salinas River and its Alluvium, Templeton, California, Fugro, 2012
3.	TCSD Change in Wastewater Operations Project Biological Assessment, Sage Institute, 2012
4.	Linear Archaeological Inventory Survey of a proposed ±2.3 mile sewer line, Templeton, San Luis Obispo County, California, Cultural Resource Management Services, 2011
5.	Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration TCSD Water Retrieval Project, TCSD, 2005
6.	Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration Templeton Community Services District Percolation Pond Expansion Project, TCSD 2005
7.	Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County-Paso Robles Area, Natural Resource Conservation Service, USDA
8.	CEQA Air Quality Handbook, San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District, 2009
9.	**ADDENDUM TO A PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVENTORY SURVEY OF A PROPOSED ±2.3 MILE SEWER LINE, TEMPLETON, SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, CRMS, April 2013**

III. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

MITIGATION MEASURES / MONITORING AND REPORTING.

Measure BIO-1 To mitigate potential adverse effects on American badger, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey at least 30 days before initial site disturbance for pipeline construction to identify whether badgers are using any portion of the site. The survey shall cover the boundaries of proposed disturbance and 100 feet beyond, and shall examine both old and new dens. If potential badger dens are found, they shall be inspected to determine whether they are occupied by badgers. Occupation of the den shall be determined by one or more of the following methods:

a. Use of a fiber optic scope to examine the den to the end;
b. Partially obstruct the den entrance with sticks, grass, and leaves for three consecutive nights and examine for signs that animals are entering or leaving the den; and
c. Dust the den entrance with a fine layer of dust or tracking material for three consecutive nights and examine the following mornings for footprints representing badger use.

Inactive dens within construction areas shall be excavated and backfilled by hand with a shovel to prevent re-use of dens during construction. If badgers are found in dens between August and January, a qualified biologist shall establish a 50-foot diameter exclusion zone around the den entrance. To avoid disturbance and the possibility of direct take of badgers, no construction, grading, or staging of equipment shall be conducted within the buffer area until the biologist has determined that the badgers have vacated the den. If badgers are found in dens between February and July, nursing young may be present. Therefore, a County-approved biologist shall establish a 200-foot diameter buffer area around the den. No construction, grading, or staging or equipment shall be conducted within the buffer.

Mitigation Implementation/Monitoring

1) **Performance Standard:** Conduct survey and implement measures to reduce impacts
2) **Contingency Measure:** As identified by biologist
3) **Implementation Responsibility:** District
4) **Implementation Schedule**: Pre-construction and during construction
5) **Monitoring Method:** District retain biologist

Measure BIO-2 To mitigate potential impacts on sensitive plant species during construction of the pipeline, conduct a floristic inventory and rare plant survey of annual grassland habitat within the project alignment focusing on the presence/absence of rare, threatened, or endangered plant species discussed above. To ensure adequacy of the floristic inventory and rare plant survey, it should be conducted in accordance with the guidelines recommended by the California Native Plant Society, CDFG, and the USFWS that includes:

• Conducting the survey at the proper time of year when rare plants are both evident and

identifiable. This is typically during the spring/summer flowering period.
• Surveys that are floristic in nature. That is all plant species noted in the field are identified to the level necessary to determine if it is rare, threatened, or endangered.
• Conducting the survey using systematic field techniques in all suitable habitats of the site to ensure a reasonable and thorough coverage.
• Up to three visits to the site may be necessary to ensure that seasonal variations in the flowering period of the target species are adequately covered.

If non formally-listed special-status plant species are detected during the above survey, the following should be implemented:
• All soil and plant material that is cleared and grubbed for construction, and the top six inches of surface material excavated for the pipeline trench, shall be salvaged and stockpiled for use in re-spreading on the surface as part of Best Management Practices for restoration of the disturbed areas and to minimize the potential for post-project weed invasion.

Mitigation Implementation/Monitoring

1) **Performance Standard:** Conduct survey at appropriate season and implement measures to reduce impacts
2) **Contingency Measure:** As identified by biologist
3) **Implementation Responsibility:** District
4) **Implementation Schedule**: Pre-construction and during construction
5) **Monitoring Method:** District retain biologist

Measure BIO-3 Vegetation removal and initial site disturbance shall be conducted between September 1 and January 31 outside of the nesting season for birds. If vegetation removal is planned for the bird nesting season (February 1 to August 31), then preconstruction nesting bird surveys shall be required to determine if any active nests would be impacted by project construction. If no active nests are found, then no further mitigation shall be required. If any active nests are found that would be impacted by construction, then the nest sites shall be avoided with the establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone around active nests as determined by a qualified biologist. Nest sites shall be avoided and protected with the non-disturbance buffer zone until the adults and young of the year are no longer reliant on the nest site for survival as determined by a qualified biologist. As such, avoiding disturbance or take of an active nest would reduce potential impacts on nesting birds to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Implementation/Monitoring

1) **Performance Standard:** Conduct survey at appropriate season and implement measures to reduce impacts
2) **Contingency Measure:** As identified by biologist
3) **Implementation Responsibility:** District
4) **Implementation Schedule**: Pre-construction
5) **Monitoring Method:** District retain biologist

Measure CUL-1 If prehistoric or historic cultural materials are encountered during any phase of property grading or excavation, the work should be halted until a qualified archaeologist can make an assessment of the resources and proper mitigation measures are formulated in accordance with County guidelines.

Mitigation Implementation/Monitoring

1) **Performance Standard:** Grading Plans to include notes to stop work if cultural remains unearthed.
2) **Contingency Measure:** As identified by archaeologist and County guidelines
3) **Implementation Responsibility:** District
4) **Implementation Schedule**: during construction
5) **Monitoring Method:** District verify grading plan provides directives to stop work if cultural remains unearthed,